

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed October 29, 2007 has been received and the Examiner's comments carefully reviewed. Claims 1 - 40 are rejected. Claims 1, 25 and 38 have been amended. For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1 - 5, 9, 12, 14 - 17, 23 - 24, 25, 30, 34 - 35, 37 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,917,373 to Vong et al. (hereinafter Vong). Claims 6 - 8, 26, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Vong in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,459,440 to Monnes et al. (hereinafter Monnes), and U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0,142,201A1 to Babka. Claims 10 - 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Vong in view of U.S. Patent 5,974,135 to Breneman et al. (hereinafter Breneman). Claims 13, 18 - 19, 21, 27 - 28, 31 - 33 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Vong in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,937,950 to Cragun et al. (hereinafter Cragun). The Applicants respectfully disagree but have amended the claims to address the rejection and request the rejection be withdrawn.

As amended, Claim 1 recites at least the following limitations not described, suggested or otherwise taught in the cited references, either separately or in combination:

“detecting an alert in response to a trigger; *wherein the trigger is associated with one of a plurality of different trigger types*”

“*automatically selecting* the alert *from a plurality* of alerts in response to identifying the alert;”

“*automatically activating* an alert mode operating state in response to the selected alert;”

“mapping a context of the user interface ***to another context*** that is associated with the selected alert when the alert mode operating state is active;”

In Contrast to Applicants Claim 1, Vong teaches a snooze function that may be activated by a user. For example, the Office Action states that “Regarding claim 1, Vong discloses a method of alerting a user of a device that includes user interface, comprising: detecting trigger in response to a trigger, identifying the alert associated with the trigger, activating the alert mode operating state to a selected alert, mapping the context of the user interface (for e.g., SNOZZE function in fig. 11A) to another context that is associated with the selected alert when the alert operating state is active, and notifying the user of the selected alert through the user interface when the alert operating state is active (figs. 11A, 11B; col. 12 lines 37 - 59).” (Office Action, page 3).

Vong teaches an alert that presents a user with soft buttons. For example, when an alarm reminds a user to pick their child up from soccer, a user is presented with two soft buttons: a first soft button to dismiss the alarm, a second soft button to snooze the alarm. In either case, selection of the feature to be activated is controlled by which soft button the user manually selects.

As stated by Vong “[b]y selecting the soft label function Dismiss displayed in display region 630, control returns to the previous screen, which is then displayed, and the appointment is dismissed. If instead, the user selects the soft label snooze, control returns to the previous screen, which is then displayed and the alert is reset to remind the user again of the appointment in a predefined number of minutes (e.g., 10 minutes).” (Vong, col. 12 lines 53-59).

Vong fails to teach that the operating states are ***automatically selected in response to the selected alert***, as is found in Applicant’s claim 1. In direct contrast to automatic selection, Vong

teaches that such alerts must be activated by a user's manual selection using a button. Moreover, Vong would not function if such alerts were automatically activated since an alert that is automatically dismissed or snoozed could not properly alert the user of the event. Therefore, Vong teaches away from using automatic selection.

Vong also fails to teach detecting an alert in response to a trigger; *wherein the trigger is associated with one of a plurality of different trigger types*, as is found in Applicants amended claim 1. When the alarm of Vong is triggered, the screen illustrated by Figures 11A and 11B are displayed, which illustrates that the alarm may be dismissed or snoozed. The dismiss and snooze options are not displayed in response to a trigger that is associated with a plurality of different trigger types. Therefore, Vong does not teach wherein the trigger is associated with one of a plurality of different trigger types.

Further still, Vong fails to teach *automatically selecting* the alert *from a plurality* of alerts in response to identifying the alert. The alert that Vong teaches is not selected from a plurality of alerts. When the alarm goes off, the alert illustrated in Figures 11A and 11B is displayed. Vong does not teach the step of selecting. Therefore, Vong does not teach selecting of a particular alert *from a plurality of alerts*.

Since Vong does not teach, describe or otherwise suggest the above-described elements Applicants Claim 1, and since Vong teaches away from using the above-described automatic selection process, Claim 1 is proposed to be allowable. Claims 2 - 24 are proposed to be allowable as they depend from a valid base claim.

For example, Claim 3 recites "wherein the plurality of different trigger types corresponds to at least one of a time based trigger, an event based trigger, and a peer-to-peer based trigger."

The Office Action states “Regarding claims 2-5, 9, 12, 14-17, 23-24, 30, 34-35, 37, Vong further teaches the following:… trigger corresponds to an event based trigger that is associated with at least one of low battery warning, stolen device warning, and a message function (col. 7 lines 53-66)” (Office Action, pages 3-4). The trigger Vong teaches at col. 7 lines 53-66 do not however, trigger an alert that is identified and automatically selected from a plurality of alerts in response to identification. For at least the above stated reasons, Claims 1 – 24 are believed to be in form for allowance and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

****** This is where I am stopping : do the same thing for claims 25 and 38 that I did with claim 1, quote the claim terms ******

As amended, Claim 25 recites at least the following limitations not described, suggested or otherwise taught in the cited references, either separately or in combination:

“a means for *detecting a triggering* event;”

“a means for *identifying an alert that is associated with the triggering event;*”
wherein the alert provides a user an indication that the triggering event has occurred;”

“a means for *automatically selecting* the alert that is identified as associated with the triggering event; *wherein the alert is selected from a plurality of different alerts* that are each associated with a *different type of event;*”

“a means for activating an alert mode operating state in response to the selected alert”

In Contrast to Applicants Claim 25, Vong teaches a snooze function that may be activated by a user. As stated above, Vong fails to teach identifying an alert that is associated with the triggering event; wherein the alert provides a user an indication that the triggering event

has occurred. Further, Vong fails to teach automatically selecting the alert that is identified as associated with the triggering event; wherein the alert is selected from a plurality of different alerts that are each associated with a different type of event. For at least the reasons stated above, Claim 25 is proposed to be allowable. Claims 26-37 are proposed to be allowable as they depend from a valid base claim.

As amended, Claim 25 recites at least the following limitations not described, suggested or otherwise taught in the cited references, either separately or in combination:

“an electronic system that is arranged to interact with the user interface and the display, wherein the electronic system is configured to:”

“*detect a trigger alert in response to a trigger;*”

“*identify an alert* that is associated with the trigger alert; “

“*automatically select the alert from a plurality of alerts* in response to identifying the alert;”

“*automatically activate an alert mode operating state in response to a selected alert;*

“map a context of the user interface to another context that is associated with the selected alert”

In Contrast to Applicants Claim 25, Vong teaches a snooze function that may be activated by a user. As stated above, Vong fails to teach automatically select the alert from a plurality of alerts in response to identifying the alert. Further, Vong fails to teach automatically activate an alert mode operating state in response to a selected alert. For at least the reasons stated above, Claim 38 is proposed to be allowable. Claims 39-40 are proposed to be allowable as they depend from a valid base claim.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all pending claims are believed to be allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further issues regarding this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the applicant at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P. O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
206.342.6200

/ Brett A. Hertzberg /

Brett A. Hertzberg
Registration No. 42,660
Direct Dial: 206.342.6255
(BAH/ab)

